Point of Order regarding Question No. 221.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—On a point of order. Question No. 221, 'the reasons why highly salaried officers who can command margins of savings over and above their costs of living on a liberal standard take bribes'. My submission is it is going too far and all liberties allowed for questioning have been exceeded. (*Hear, hear.*) That question ought to be expunged. It is defamatory and a slur upon the officers of Government and so many other things which I need not say. Therefore, the President will exercise his right to expunge the same.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—It is a double question, about receiving bribes and the reasons for permitting them to take bribes; and the answer of the Government is very funny—that Government have no information.

President.—There is nothing in the question which makes the language defamatory. There is a provision in the rules of the Council which provides that an Hon'ble Member making a statement shall be responsible for the statement he makes. If the President excludes every question which contains an unpleasant statement the rights of the Members to ask questions will be greatly limited. To my mind the rule which provides that every Hon'ble Member shall be responsible for the statement he makes, is meant to cover such allegations as are contained in that question. That is why I admitted the question.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—If the President will kindly allow me I will read rule (8). 'The question shall relate to a single matter and it shall not contain arguments, inferences, ironical expressions and defamatory statements'. This is defaming the whole service, whatever service it is.

Mr. M. Krishna Menon.—The question seems to be only a hypothetical one. It does not refer to an officer of this State.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—There has been a previous instance of expunging by the President in this House.

President.—The question of expunging it will be considered.

The Cochin Nambudiri Bill.

Mr. P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri.—Sir, I rise to move for leave to introduce the Cochin Nambudiri Bill.

Mr. C. N. Ittiravi Nambudiri.—I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—I rise to move for leave to introduce the Cochin Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill.

Mr. P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri.—I second it.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—With your leave, Sir, I beg to oppose this motion. I realise, Sir, that it has been the practice on this side of the House for non-officials not to thwart the introduction of bills provided they do not materially affect the people of different castes and creeds living in the State. This Bill, the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill, seems to me to be an exception. I don't think that there is any necessity or that there is any justification for the introduction of this Bill in the Cochin State at least during the present times. The Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill will be a very pernicious measure tending to disrupt society, to create confusion and to hamper the well being of the different classes and creeds of His Highness' subjects. It is obvious that there is no compulsion for any body to be in the fold of any particular religion. If anybody wants to change his religion he is welcome so that instead of creating confusion by the extension of vested rights to a convert from one religion to another it would be in the best interests of persons so minded to take whatever they can from the original family if that is permissible, get himself converted and do as he pleases. In the objects and reasons given for the introduction of this Bill, in section 4, it is stated "so much of any law or usage now in force in Cochin as inflicts on any person, forfeiture of rights of property or may be held in any way to impair or affect any rights of inheritance by reason of his renouncing or having been excluded from the communion of any religion or being deprived of caste shall cease to be enforced as law in the Courts of the State." So far as that section is concerned, that is the only substantial section in the regulation, the convert should not lose his vested rights in the property even if he.....

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—On a point of order. Under S. O. 30 if a motion for leave to introduce is opposed the President after permitting the mover of the bill to give a brief explanatory statement shall call for a statement from the Member who opposed. So the statement is to come from the Mover of the bill.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Generally leave to introduce is given to all bills and, therefore, I think my bill also will share the same privilege or fate. Why should this bill be singled out for a differential treatment?

Motion put and carried.

The Cochin Civil Marriage Bill.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—I rise to move for leave to introduce the Cochin Civil Marriage Bill.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—I second the motion.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—I oppose the motion for leave to introduce the Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly